

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,255		02/27/2004	Henning Osterwald	095309.53251US	1327
23911	7590 08/23/2004			EXAMINER	
CROWELL	& MO	RING LLP	MOHANTY, BIBHU R		
INTELLECT	TUAL PI	ROPERTY GROUP			
P.O. BOX 14300				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300				3747	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		ν Λ Λ
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/787,255	OSTERWALD, HENNING
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Bibhu Mohanty	3747
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
Period for Reply		ONTU(S) FROM
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above, is less than thirty (30) days, at - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by standard properties of the maximum statutory perions of the perion	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a lareply within the statutory minimum of thir lod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27	February 2004.	
	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the applicati	on.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	Irawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		
Applicant may not request that any objection to t		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Burn	ents have been received. ents have been received in <i>F</i> riority documents have beer	Application No
* See the attached detailed Office action for a l	list of the certified copies not	received.
Attachment(s)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention.

In claim 1, the last 3 lines of the claim are unclear. The phrase "are to be different" is unclear since it is not apparent what valve control times are being compared to each other. Also, the phrase "whereby.......device" at the end is very unclear and indefinite. It appears that the cylinders supplying the exhaust gas recirculation device are being compared to themselves.

In claim 25, the last 4 lines of the claim are unclear. The phrase "are to be different" is unclear since it is not apparent what valve control times are being compared to each other. Also, the phrase "whereby.......device" at the end is very unclear and indefinite. It appears that the cylinders supplying the exhaust gas recirculation device are being compared to themselves.

The claims are examined to the extent understood.

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russ et al. US Patent 5,934,263.

Application/Control Number: 10/787,255

Art Unit: 3747

Russ has disclosed the invention substantially as claimed showing a engine in which an exhaust gas recirculation device (EGR) is used (see column 6, line 15). The distribution of the recirculated exhaust gas among the individual cylinders is different since only partial cylinders are activated at certain times (see column 6, first full ppgh). Note that the valve "overlap" times will be "none at all" for the deactivated cylinders. However, Russ does not show the device to use an exhaust gas turbocharger.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that turbochargers are known in the art to provide engines with extra power.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Russ to include a turbocharger system as known in the art to provide extra power.

With regard to claims 3-6, the deactivated cylinders will inherently receive none of the recirculated exhaust gas.

With regard to claims 7-12, the device of Russ uses six cylinders.

With regard to claims 13-24, the use of a commonly known throttle valve for the EGR valve is considered an obvious use of a known valve.

With regard to claims 25-30, the claimed method steps follow from simply using the proposed device.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bibhu Mohanty whose telephone number is 703 308-3706. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

Art Unit: 3747

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Yuen can be reached on 703 308-1946. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bibhu Mohanty Primary Examiner Art Unit 3747

brm